

Review of: "Further Chaos and Dysfunction in the Brickyard and the Systems That Support It"

Samah Chemli Horchani¹

¹ University of Tunis El Manar

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

1. Originality: Does the paper contain new and significant information adequate to justify publication?

Originality is manifested through:

- The response to the gap: The manuscript responds to the gap: by raising several dysfunctions related to education and scientific research.

2. Relationship to Literature: Does the paper demonstrate an adequate understanding of the relevant literature in the field and cite an appropriate range of literature sources? Is any significant work ignored?

The author refers to three basic references which are not up to date. It is essential to see other recent references.

Work suggestions:

Jensen, D. (2006). Metaphors as a bridge to understanding educational and social contexts. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 5(1), 36-54.

Low, G. (2008). Metaphor and education. *The Cambridge handbook of metaphor and thought*, 212, 231.

Rustamova, S. (2023). PROBLEMS AND SOLUTIONS TO ENGLISH TEACHING. *Журнал иностранных языков и лингвистики*, 5(5).

Sallam, M. (2023, March). ChatGPT utility in healthcare education, research, and practice: systematic review on the promising perspectives and valid concerns. In *Healthcare* (Vol. 11, No. 6, p. 887). MDPI.

3. Methodology: Is the paper's argument built on an appropriate base of theory, concepts, or other ideas? Has the research or equivalent intellectual work on which the paper is based been well designed? Are the methods employed appropriate?

The idea of using the metaphor is very original. The author uses stylistics figures to express his perception of the treated subject. The paper is well designed. The methodological approach is out of the ordinary. However, the opening of scientific research field authorizes the novelty acceptance. However, the work was not based on statistical studies allowing the generalization or the justification of the arguments. The author presents his experience which resembles a qualitative study based on the observation of lived experience. This experience is a continuation of Forscher's (1963) experience, which in turn constituted the theoretical foundation of the work.

4. Results: Are results presented clearly and analyzed appropriately? Do the conclusions adequately tie together the other elements of the paper?

I think the results are analyzed properly even though the results require the reader to focus heavily and project into the

author's experience.

At the conclusion level, the opening deals with the master builders, their characteristics, and their roles. It is better to write one paragraph and reduce the number of questions.

5. Implications for research, practice and/or society: Does the paper clearly identify any implications for research, practice and/or society? Does the paper bridge the gap between theory and practice? How can the research be used in practice (economic and commercial impact), in teaching, to influence public policy, in research (contributing to the body of knowledge)? What is the impact upon society (influencing public attitudes, affecting quality of life)? Are these implications consistent with the findings and conclusions of the paper?

A critical vision of reality according to the author

6. Quality of Communication: Does the paper clearly express its case, measured against the technical language of the field and the expected knowledge of the journal's readership? Has attention been paid to the clarity of expression and readability, such as sentence structure, jargon use, acronyms, etc.

The paper reflects a literary effort in terms of the metaphor used to point out weaknesses related to education and scientific research. The work presents a strong criticism linked to the author's experience.

Having a critical vision is essential to advance science. Criticism is one of the bases for research advancement. The present review ensures the detection of weaknesses and the highlighting of the manuscript advantages. Therefore, I suggest reducing the criticism intensity. The generalization is refuted concerning editorial practices, peer reviews or also discrimination. They exist but author might try to mention the good and the bad. Science really needs it.

The vision is very pessimistic and the only time the author mentions positive government efforts, the result was negative. I also suggest emphasizing good bricks that are made by bad builders or builders who master new tools and new skills related mainly to artificial intelligence.

It is essential to suggest some solutions so that the criticism is constructive.

Dr. Samah Chemli Horchani

Assistant Professor

Management Department, Tunis El-Manar University, Faculty of Economics and Management Sciences of Tunis FSEGT, Tunis, Tunisia.

Laboratory of Innovation Strategy Entrepreneurship Finance and Economics LISEFE, Campus Universitaire Farhat Hached, B.P. 248 - El Manar II, 2092, Tunis, Tunisia

Professional coach in Agility, Design Thinking, Entrepreneurship and Innovation Management

